

Minutes

General Education Council

March 29, 2021 via Webex

Present: Dr. Robin Blankenship, Dr. Christina Conroy, Dr. Laurie Couch Dr. Michael Fultz, Dr. Morgan Getchell, Dr. Wilson Gonzalez-Espada, Dr. Mark Graves (presiding), Dr. Shannon Harr, Dr. Kouroush Jenab, Mr. Keith Moore, Ms. Kerry Murphy, Ms. Lora Pace, Dr. Thomas Pappas, Dr. Robert Royar, Dr. Edna Schack, Dr. Chris Schroeder & Dr. Timothy Simpson

Absent: Dr. Bo Shi

- I. **Minutes from March 15, 2021** – Dr. Gonzalez-Espada moved to approve. Chris Schroeder seconded the motion. Minutes were approved unanimously.
- II. **Benchmark Scores for Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Assessment** – The Council is tasked with setting the benchmark scores for SLO assessment in the 2021+ General Education Program. Dr. Royar suggested that the benchmark be set as a percentage of students who would attain the SLO. Dr. Schack asked about levels of student achievement in the past and suggested a slightly higher bar. Dr. Couch stated that the data available was for the current general education program, not the new SLOs (although some continue from one to the another). Dr. Harr stated that 70% of students attained most SLOs in the current program, but not all. Drs. Couch and Harr both suggested raising the percentage and asked members to consider if 30% of students not meeting an SLO was acceptable. Dr. Blankenship stated that setting a higher benchmark without any data on the 2021+ SLOs would be premature. Dr. Graves asked what the repercussions of not meeting the benchmarks were. Dr. Harr explained that when a benchmark is not met, it would be necessary to engage in continuous improvement. Dr. Simpson raised a question about assessment and grading when the course is both a general education and a program course. Dr. Conroy stated that the general education assessment assignments would likely not comprise the whole course grade so it would be possible for students to not meet the standard for the SLO but receive an acceptable grade and vice versa. Dr. Schack asked about the history of the 70% benchmark used in the current program and recollection by Council members was that it was because it would be the equivalent of a “C” average and a 2.0 GPA is considered “in good standing” at the University. Dr. Royar advocated for increasing the number of students who attained the benchmark but not increasing the score that marks whether or not it is attained. Dr. Gonzalez-Espada raised the issue that according to the rubrics, a student could get a “meets standard” on all performance indicators and the overall score in terms of percentage would be 66%. The Council further discussed setting the bar for attaining the SLO without using a percentage score. Dr. Conroy expressed concern of requiring students to meet standard for each individual performance indicator. She and Dr. Gonzalez-Espada advocated for an average score of the performance indicators. Dr. Couch and Dr. Harr suggested stipulating a minimum number of performance indicators that must meet the

standard. Dr. Royar stated that with ideal instruments, failure to meet standard on any one performance indicator is evidence that the student does not meet the SLO. Dr. Conroy expressed that she did not feel that the instruments were ideal. Dr. Harr stated that it is important to collect data properly for individual performance indicators to determine if there is a problem with each indicator. Dr. Conroy asked if there was flexibility to not set a benchmark for the first year. Drs. Couch and Harr were reluctant to not set a benchmark. Dr. Harr stated that it was acceptable to not meet a target as long as you address and plan for improvement. Several members expressed concern with raising the benchmark of the percentage of students attaining the SLO. Dr. Fultz made a motion that the benchmark be "70% of students will meet the standard for each Student Learning Outcome with an average score of the performance indicator criteria". Dr. Blankenship suggested the inclusion of the numerical score of 2 and Dr. Fultz amended the motion. Dr. Schack asked that the motion include a statement that the benchmark be evaluated annually. Dr. Fultz was agreeable. Therefore, the motion was amended to: 70% of students will meet the standard for each Student Learning Outcome with an average score of the performance indicator criteria of 2, with this level of achievement being evaluated annually. Dr. Blankenship seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

III. **Presentation of Fall 2020 GE Assessment Results:** Dr. Harr provided the fall 2020 preliminary Data Report #2 [attachment]. He stated that all attainment was well over 70% on all SLOs. He noted that SLO 1c and 2c allowed sampling and the percentage assessed would likely increase. SLO 1c (34%), 2b (58%) and 6b (68%) did not meet the reported assessment goal of 70%. The sections for Writing I and II have been received but have not been broken down into individual sections for reporting purposes which results in a low sections assessed numbers for those general education courses and also in Eagle Scholar sections assessed. When the Writing I and II are broken into individual sections, the Eagle Scholar sections assessed number will increase as well. He noted the following important points and areas of concern.

- SLO 1C – will be adjusted for sampling so number of assessed will increase
- SLO 2B – low assessment percentage (58%), due to 11 course sections in NSC2 not assessing the SLO
 - NOTE – 7 course sections assessed two of three SLOs, omitting SLO 2b (ESS 102-all sections)
- SLO 6B – low assessment percentage (68%), due to 9 course sections in HUM1 not assessing the SLO
 - NOTE – 1 course section assessed two of three SLOs, omitting SLO 2b (MUSH 261-005)
- All SLOs are above attainment threshold of 70%
- SLO 2d (assessed only in FYS 101) improved from 56% attainment in fall 2019, 55% attainment in spring 2020 to 94% attainment in fall 2020.
 - Likely due to action plan put in place in spring of 2020 to familiarize instructors with rubric and to have instructors review rubric with students
 - Point value of assignment was also increased

Dr. Harr also stated that with the transition from the current general education program to the new, the Council needs only to examine attainment for the SLOs that are in both and are assessed in the same courses. He reported the following for fall but reminded that the data would be combined with Spring before determining if action is needed.

- SLO 1B (SLO 1 going forward) - No concerns with courses remaining in curriculum
- SLO 1C (SLO 2 going forward) - ENG 200 – 66% attainment for fall 2020
- SLO 1A (SLO 3 going forward) - No concerns with courses remaining in curriculum
- SLO 2A (SLO 5 going forward) - ENG 200 – 60% attainment for fall 2020

Dr. Conroy stated that she has severed on the team that scored the assessment for FYS for a couple of years. She attributed some of the major improvement to the scorers better applying the rubric. She stated that scoring factors could impact assessment results as well. Dr. Couch stated that the approach taken with FYS with bringing parties together to discuss and work through the SLO and the rubric etc. is the approach that is part of the approved assessment cycle for the 2021+ program. Dr. Conroy asked if communications will occur across the different departments that offer courses that assess the same SLOs. Dr. Couch indicated that would be facilitated but first the verification forms must be approved.

IV. **FYS Subcommittee Report** – postponed to next meeting.

V. **Old Business:** Dr. Graves stated that he, Dr. Harr and Dr. Couch would meet to make preparations to begin the process of reviewing verification forms. He asked the Council to expect correspondence prior to the April 12 meeting. Dr. Conroy asked if the verification forms that were voted on by email were approved. Dr. Couch stated that all of them were and asked administrative support personnel to include the results in the minutes. [Results in the table below]

Name	COMS 108 SLO 3	COMS 108 SLO 5	ENG 200 SLO 5	FYS 101 SLO 5
Chris Schroeder	Approve	Approve	Approve	Approve
Tim Simpson	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
Edna Schack	Approve	Approve	Approve	Approve
Thomas Pappas	Approve	Approve	Approve	Approve
Christina Conroy	Do Not Approve COMS 108 SLO 3: This SLO requires “a variety of contexts”. This SLO is only measured in COMS 108. There is only 1 speech. So there is not	Approve	Approve	Approve

	a “variety of contexts”. It does not measure the SLO.			
Bo Shi				
Kouroush Jenab	Approve	Approve	Approve	Approve
Mike Fultz	Approve	Approve	Approve	Approve
Wilson Gonzalez-Espada	Approve	Approve	Approve Provided comments directly to Dr. Graves. Dr. Graves states that the writing committee agreed to a modification of the questions.	Approve
Robin Blankenship	Approve	Approve. Error on voting sheet listing course as COMS 105 instead of 108.	Approve	Approve. Grammatical errors.
Morgan Getchell	Approve	Approve. Error on voting sheet listing course as COMS 105 instead of 108.	Approve	Approve
Robert Royar	Approve	Do Not Approve I could not see the way that this SLO would be assessed. For example, it would be difficult to distinguish between appropriate and effective and appropriate and ineffective sources just following the description.	Approve Agree with Dr. Schack's concerns	Approve
	9 of 12 Approve	9 of 12 Approve	10 of 12 Approve	10 of 12 Approve

VI. New Business: None.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: April 12, 2021



General Education Council Meeting March 29, 2021

Fall 2020 Preliminary Data Report #2

Shannon Harr
Director of University Assessment

Planning Performance & Effectiveness

Fall 2020	Enrolled	Assessed	% Assessed	Attained	% Attained
SLO					
1a	1477	1327	90%	1259	95%
1b	5791	4985	86%	4272	86%
1c	2618	881	34%	731	83%
1d	1905	1609	84%	1425	89%
2a	3097	2781	90%	2401	86%
2b	925	541	58%	441	82%
2c	1047	899	86%	736	82%
2d	1107	970	88%	909	94%
2e	1606	1449	90%	1408	97%
3a	1502	1371	91%	1168	85%
3b	1502	1314	87%	1064	81%
3c	1502	1335	89%	1079	81%
4a	810	749	92%	652	87%
4b	1529	1145	75%	1026	90%
4c	729	562	77%	516	92%
4d	2170	1962	90%	1747	89%
5a	1075	996	93%	843	85%
5b	2000	1652	83%	1408	85%
5c	925	710	77%	573	81%
6a	800	578	72%	499	86%
6b	800	547	68%	442	81%

Planning Performance & Effectiveness

Fall 2020	Sections	Sections Assessed	% Sections Assessed	Enrolled	# Assessed	% Assessed	Attained	% Attained
ORAL	36	36	100.0%	978	879	89.9%	850	96.7%
WRITE1	72	2	2.8%	1882	1677	89.1%	1503	89.6%
WRITE2	14	2	14.3%	237	246	103.8%	154	62.6%
MATH	70	70	100.0%	1502	1373	91.4%	1213	88.3%
FYS	66	66	100.0%	1107	984	88.9%	977	99.3%
CAPSTONE	55	46	83.6%	506	476	94.1%	459	96.4%
HUM1	36	28	77.8%	800	586	73.3%	519	88.6%
HUM2	33	31	93.9%	729	608	83.4%	565	92.9%
NSC1	36	36	100.0%	1075	1030	95.8%	926	89.9%
NSC2	35	31	88.6%	925	757	81.8%	665	87.8%
SBS1	27	27	100.0%	810	767	94.7%	701	91.4%
SBS2	37	33	89.2%	1095	984	89.9%	920	93.5%
TOTAL	517	408	78.9%	11646	10367	89.0%	9452	91.2%
EARLY COLLEGE	100	55	55.0%	2727	1149	42.1%	1071	93.2%
ONLINE	172	145	84.3%	4065	3409	83.9%	3145	92.3%
EXTENDED CAMPUS	6	6	100.0%	20	53	265.0%	48	90.6%

Planning Performance & Effectiveness

Important Points & Areas of Concern

- SLO 1C – will be adjusted for sampling so number of assessed will increase
- SLO 2B – low assessment percentage (58%), due to 11 course sections in NSC2 not assessing the SLO
 - NOTE – 7 course sections assessed two of three SLOs, omitting SLO 2b (ESS 102- all sections)
- SLO 6B – low assessment percentage (68%), due to 9 course sections in HUM1 not assessing the SLO
 - NOTE – 1 course section assessed two of three SLOs, omitting SLO 2b (MUSH 261-005)
- All SLOs are above attainment threshold of 70%
- SLO 2d (assessed only in FYS 101) improved from 56% attainment in fall 2019, 55% attainment in spring 2020 to 94% attainment in fall 2020.
 - Likely due to action plan put in place in spring of 2020 to familiarize instructors with rubric and to have instructors review rubric with students
 - Point value of assignment was also increased

Planning Performance & Effectiveness

Learning Outcomes Remaining in Gen Ed Curriculum

1. Students read college-level texts for comprehension (currently SLO 1B)
2. Students write effectively for a targeted college-level audience using the conventions of standard American English (currently SLO 1C)
3. Students speak effectively in a variety of contexts (currently SLO 1A)
5. Students employ current research technologies in the process of locating, analyzing, evaluating, and using information (currently SLO 2A)

Need to examine attainment in courses remaining in the curriculum that are assessing these SLOs in fall 2020

Planning Performance & Effectiveness

- SLO 1B (SLO 1 going forward)
 - No concerns with courses remaining in curriculum
- SLO 1C (SLO 2 going forward)
 - ENG 200 – 66% attainment for fall 2020
- SLO 1A (SLO 3 going forward)
 - No concerns with courses remaining in curriculum
- SLO 2A (SLO 5 going forward)
 - ENG 200 – 60% attainment for fall 2020

Planning Performance & Effectiveness